



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,115	11/26/2003	John W. Barron	RSW920030264US1	1345
23550 7590 10/01/2007 HOFFMAN WARNICK & D'ALESSANDRO, LLC 75 STATE STREET 14TH FLOOR ALBANY, NY 12207			EXAMINER PATEL, CHIRAG R	
			ART UNIT 2141	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/723,115

Applicant(s)

BARRON ET AL.

Examiner

Chirag R. Patel

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al. – hereinafter Martin (US 2003/0217264) in view of Matsubara (US 2003/0225796).

As per claims 1, 10, 19, and 28, Martin discloses a computer-implemented method for providing real-time access to information on a computer system over a network, comprising:

receiving login data on the computer system from a user over the network;
retrieving access control permissions for the user based on the login data; ([0020])

receiving from the user a selection of a desired file from the list of files; and
([0020])

retrieving the desired file in real-time and communicating information in the desired file to the user. ([0020])

Martin fails to disclose presenting to the user in a user interface a list of files on the computer system the user is authorized to access, wherein the list of files is determined based on the access control permissions. Matsubara discloses presenting to the user in a user interface a list of files on the computer system the user is authorized to access, wherein the list of files is determined based on the access control permissions. ([0062]; On the other hand, if the user has access to the selected directory, then the server communicates some or all of the directory properties of the selected directory, in a step 514. The browser, in a step 516, can then display the directory properties such as the children directories and the file links, in an appropriate format.) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose presenting to the user in a user interface a list of files on the computer system the user is authorized to access, wherein the list of files is determined based on the access control permissions in the disclosure of Martin. The motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate file management by users in the client systems. ([0011])

As per claims 2, 11, 20, and 29, Martin / Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin discloses wherein the network is the Internet, and wherein the user interface is a web browser. ([0015])

As per claims 3, 12, 21, and 30, Martin / Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin discloses wherein wherein the list of files

contains at least one file type selected from the group consisting of a properties file, a configuration file and a log file. ([0004], security mechanisms, revision history and audit logs)

As per claims 4, 13, 22, and 31, Martin / Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin discloses further comprising receiving from the user a selection of a particular location within the desired file, wherein the information communicated to the user is from the particular location. ([0006])

As per claims 5, 14, 23, and 32, Martin/ Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin fails to disclose further comprising the user searching the information using the user interface. Matsubara discloses further comprising the user searching the information using the user interface. ([0007],[0062])
At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose presenting to the user, comprising the user searching the information using the user interface in the disclosure of Martin. The motivation for doing do would have been to facilitate file management by users in the client systems. ([0011])

As per claims 6, 15, 24, and 33, Martin / Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin discloses wherein said contact information entity is an entry in a database accessible across a network. ([0015])

As per claims 7, 25, and 34, Martin / Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin discloses wherein the files in the list of files are stored on the computer system. ([0015])

As per claims 8, 17, 26, and 35, Martin/ Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin discloses the information in the file is communicated to the user interface for display. ([0015])

As per claims 9, 18, 27, and 36, Martin/ Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 1. Martin fails to disclose wherein communicating the information in the desired file comprises downloading the desired file to the user for display of the information within the user interface. Matsubara discloses wherein communicating the information in the desired file comprises downloading the desired file to the user for display of the information within the user interface. ([0063]) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose wherein communicating the information in the desired file comprises downloading the desired file to the user for display of the information within the user interface in the disclosure of Martin. The motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate file management by users in the client systems. ([0011])

As per claim 16, Martin / Matsubara disclose the computer-implemented method of claim 10 receiving from the user a selection of a desired file from the list of files; and ([0020]) and accessing another one of the plurality of interconnected computer system based on the selection of the link, and wherein the desired file is retrieved in real-time from the other one of the plurality of interconnected computer systems. ([0004]; thereby enables multiple users to remotely access an electronic document in order to execute an associated workflow while still addressing concerns regarding data security and validity)

Martin fails to disclose presenting to the user a new list of files the user is authorized to access on the other one of the plurality of interconnected computer systems, wherein the selecting step comprises selecting the desired file from the new list of files. Matsubara discloses presenting to the user a new list of files the user is authorized to access on the other one of the plurality of interconnected computer systems, wherein the selecting step comprises selecting the desired file from the new list of files. ([0062]) At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to disclose presenting to the user a new list of files the user is authorized to access on the other one of the plurality of interconnected computer systems, wherein the selecting step comprises selecting the desired file from the new list of files in the disclosure of Martin. The motivation for doing do would have been to facilitate file management by users in the client systems. ([0011])

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chirag R Patel whose telephone number is (571)272-7966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pairdirect.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

Chirag Patel
Patent Examiner
AU 2141

C.P.

C.P.


JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER